

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 16 and replaces the original sheet including Figs. 15 and 16.

In Figure 15, reference numeral 24 has been added.

Attachments following last page of this Amendment:

Replacement Sheet (1 page)

Annotated Sheet Showing Change(s) (1 page)

REMARKS

The specification and Figure 15 have been amended to correct the error noted by the Examiner.

The rejections will be discussed as they apply to the independent claims. Claim 1 has been cancelled, thereby obviating the rejection of claim 1 as anticipated by Rosenkranc.

Claim 2 has been rejected as anticipated by Rosenkranc. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 2 recites that the finger pad is "at the first end" of the handle, i.e., the end that is secured to the housing. See, for example, the positioning of finger pad 726 in Fig. 16 of Applicant's specification. There is clearly no finger pad in this position on Rosenkranc's handle. The position that the Examiner alleges has a finger pad (which Applicant does not concede), in the diagram on page 4 of the office action, is approximately halfway between the first end and a second end of Rosenkranc's handle. Thus, even if there is a finger pad in the area indicated by the Examiner, this cannot fairly be construed to be "at the first end" of the handle. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 3 has been rejected as obvious in view of Rosenkranc combined with Gilder. While Applicant does not concede that this rejection is proper, in order to expedite prosecution Applicant has amended claim 3 to recite that the portions of the bifurcated handle join at the first end to enclose the region defined by the portions. This is clearly not the case in the Gilder reference, which is cited to supply a teaching of a bifurcated handle. Thus, neither reference teaches or suggests a handle having a bifurcated construction as now claimed, and Applicant accordingly respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

The dependent claims are patentable for at least the reason that they depend from patentable base claims. Bony does not supply that which is lacking in the Rosenkranc and Gilder, as discussed above.

Merely because Applicant has not addressed each and every position taken by the Examiner, this does not mean that Applicant has conceded any of these points. Applicant reserves the right to address any such issues in further prosecution.

Applicant : Michael J. Gray et al.
Serial No. : 10/798,541
Filed : March 11, 2004
Page : 8 of 8

Attorney's Docket No : 00216-665001 / Case 8135

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing Attorney
Docket No. 00216-665001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 7, 2006

/Celia H. Leber/
Celia H. Leber
Reg. No. 33,524

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

Z1392906.doc